

## REMARKS

The claims have been amended and new claims have been added to further define the invention. Applicants respectfully request the examination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In a final Office action dated July 21, 1999, in the parent of the present application, claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-22, 25-28, 30-33, and 36-49, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,727,159 to Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,816 to Broadwin et al. et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,748,188 to Hu et al. This rejection is traversed.

The examiner argues that Kikinis teaches all features except "the limitation that interactive elements contained within the network information." The examiner argues that Broadwin et al. shows a system where interactive elements, in the form of user entry fields or images, are contained within an HTML document. The examiner cites col. 18, lines 52-67 and col. 19, lines 1-6 of Broadwin et al. in support of this argument. The examiner further argues that it would have been obvious to combine Kikinis and Broadwin et al. "in order to increase adaptability of interactive enhanced HTML documents to a variety of user computer display types."

The examiner then argues that the combination of Kikinis and Broadwin et al. fails to teach the claim limitation of "creating a second network information, based upon the originally retrieved network information, which comprises definitions based upon characteristics of the interactive elements." The examiner points out that Hu et al. teaches a server that sends data to a client, which analyzes data and parses it into two types of data. The two types of data is then used to form an image. The examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill to combine Kikinis with Broadwin et al. "in order to increase adaptability of interactive-enhanced HTML documents to a variety of user computer display types."

Finally, the examiner notes that the combination of Kikinis and Broadwin et al. fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "creating a second network information based upon the originally retrieved network information, which comprises definitions based upon characteristics of the interactive elements." To remedy this deficiency, the examiner cites Hu et al. for teaching a client/server architecture wherein a client parses data into two types of data, one of the types being information for graphical data, and sending the two types of data to an "object creation device" that forms an image. The examiner argues that one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine Kikinis, Broadwin et al., and Hu et al. in order to increase adaptability of displaying HTML documents including interactive elements on different user computer displays.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-22, 25-28, 30-33, and 36-49. At the outset, applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn because it fails to make a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to each and every claim limitation. The examiner only provides general citations to teachings in the references and corresponding general language when referring to the claims. The examiner does not address several of the claim limitations directly, making it impossible for applicants to determine how the references were applied to the claims. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Kikinis, Broadwin et al., and Hu et al., whether considered alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to either teach or suggest the invention as claimed. Kikinis teaches a proxy server system for allowing information to be sent to devices having respectively different types of displays. Broadwin et al., totally unrelated to either Kikinis or Hu et al., teaches displaying still video images in a television broadcast system. And Hu et al., totally unrelated to

Kikinis or Broadwin et al., teaches HTML extensions for displaying graphs. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the proxy server system of Kikinis with the still video television broadcast system of Broadwin et al. and the HTML graph display technology of Hu et al. Each of Kikinis, Broadwin et al., and Hu et al. are designed for entirely different and unrelated purposes. Therefore, because the references are not properly combinable, the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-22, 25-28, 30-33, and 36-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn.

Moreover, even if one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine Kikinis, Broadwin et al., and Hu et al., the combined references fail to teach each and every limitation claimed. The examiner argues that Kikinis teaches all features except "the limitation of interactive elements contained within the network information." This statement is inconsistent with the examiner's later statement that Kikinis and Broadwin et al. combined fail to teach the claim limitation of "creating a second network information, based upon the originally retrieved network information, which comprises definitions based upon characteristics of the interactive elements."

Nonetheless, not only does Kikinis fail to teach or suggest interactive elements contained within the network information, Broadwin et al. fails to cure this deficiency. The examiner relies on Figs. 19 and 20 of Broadwin et al. for teaching this limitation. Applicants disagree with the examiner's conclusion that the teachings of these figures renders obvious the claimed interactive elements in network information as claimed.

Broadwin et al. teaches sending still video images and an application program. There is no creation of second network information comprised of definitions related to interactive elements and display information. In Broadwin et al., a user interacts with the application program to

make selections. The application program handles all user input through a user interface. The application program is not interactive elements or definitions of interactive elements as claimed. Therefore, even if Broadwin et al. were combined with Kikinis, the combined teachings would fail to teach the claimed interactive elements, or definitions of interactive elements. Therefore, it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn because the combination of references fails to either teach or suggest the claimed interactive elements.

The examiner then notes that the combination of Kikinis and Broadwin et al. fails to teach the claim limitation of "creating a second network information, based upon the originally retrieved network information, which comprises definitions based upon characteristics of the interactive elements." The examiner argues that Hu et al. does teach this feature. Specifically, the examiner argues that Hu et al. teaches a system wherein a server sends data to a client, the client analyzes the data and parses it into two types of data, and an image is formed using the two types of data. The examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine Kikinis with Broadwin et al. "in order to increase adaptability of interactive-enhanced HTML documents to a variety of user computer display types."

Hu et al. fails to either teach or suggest the claimed creation of second network information comprised of definitions based on characteristics of the interactive elements, and therefore the combination of Hu et al., Kikinis, and Broadwin et al., fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation. Hu et al. teaches a system for displaying graphs to reduce traffic caused by transferring bit maps of graphs over a network. The system solves the problem by sending graph attributes and graph data which describes the graph rather than the bit map itself.

In contrast, the claimed invention is directed toward a system that creates definitions of interactive elements and display information based on retrieved information. The definitions of

interactive elements can be transmitted with the display information and recomposed. By creating definitions of interactive elements and display information, the claimed invention allows recombination of the retrieved information on a variety of different devices. Hu et al. teaches use of graph attributes and graph data, neither of which are interactive elements or definitions of interactive elements. THu et al.s, the claimed invention is directed to an entirely different system than Hu et al., and is designed for an entirely different purpose.

Hu et al. reduces network traffic caused by transferring bit maps of graphs, whereas the claimed invention creates a generic form of display information and definitions of interactive elements based on retrieved information. Because Hu et al. fails to teach this claim limitation, the combination of Hu et al., Kikinis, and Broadwin et al. fails to either teach or suggest the claim limitation. Therefore, the rejection based on this combination of references should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

The examiner argues that the recitation of the Internet in dependent claims 3, 9, 15, and 27, is one of design choice, and consequently not patentably distinct. Applicants disagree with this conclusion. A choice of design, in and of itself, does not constitute something obvious. The examiner has not provided a rationale as to why the recitation of using the Internet would have been obvious based on the prior art. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3, 9; 15, and 27, should be withdrawn.

The examiner argues that dependent claims 6, 12, 18-20, 30-32, 38, 39, 43, and 44, are rendered obvious by Hu et al.'s teachings at col. 6, lines 9-15 and col. 20, lines 7-14. More particularly, the Examiner argues that Hu et al. teaches receiving user requests related to the definitions. Because Hu et al. does not teach the definitions as claimed, however, it cannot teach receiving user requests related to the definitions.

Regarding the teachings of Hu et al. at col. 6, lines 9-15 and col. 20, lines 7-14, it is noted that the claimed invention requires recomposition based on user requests related to the definitions. Col. 6, lines 9-15 merely teaches allowing a user to select and specify parameters for InfoFrames, and to view, print, and save InfoFrames. This is not recomposition as claimed, which requires use of user requests related to the definitions. Therefore, col. 6, lines 9-15 of Hu et al. does not render obvious the invention as claimed.

Similarly, the teachings at col. 20, lines 7-14 of Hu et al. fail to render obvious the invention as claimed. These teachings merely teach allowing a user to define the type of InfoFrame to request from a server. The user request in Hu et al., however, is not related to any definitions of interactive elements, as claimed. Therefore, col. 20, lines 7-14 of Hu et al. does not render obvious the invention as claimed, and claims 6, 12, 18-20, 30-32, 38, 39, 43, and 44, in addition to being allowable for depending from allowable independent claims, are also allowable for these additional reasons.

The examiner also rejects claims 46-49 in view of Kikinis' teachings at col. 10, lines 33-35. More specifically, the examiner argues that at col. 10, lines 33-35, Kikinis teaches "a user's ID correlates to a user computer's display characteristics and is used throughout the session." This is not what is claimed, and therefore cannot render obvious claims 46-49. Claims 46-49 recite using captured information from one session in another request. Kikinis does not capture information from one session, and use it for another request. Therefore, the rejection of claims 46-49 should be withdrawn.

Each of the examiner's rejections presented in the Office Action dated July 21, 1999, have been addressed. Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-22, 25-28,

30-33, and 36-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kikinis in view of Broadwin et al. and Hu et al.  
be withdrawn and the claims passed to issue.

To the extent any extension of time is required to obtain entry of this response, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due in connection with filing this response which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 07-2339.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/7/00

By: 

W. Eric Webostad  
Reg. No. 35,406

GTE Service Corporation  
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03G13  
Irving, TX 75038  
Tel. (781) 466-4013  
Fax (781) 466-4021